

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 110-7

Mr. KERRY. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following treaty transmitted to the Senate on September 20, 2007, by the President of the United States: Treaty with the United Kingdom Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation, Treaty Document No. 110-7. I further ask that the treaty be considered as having been read the first time, that it be referred with accompanying papers to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith for Senate advice and consent to ratification the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation, done at Washington and London on June 21 and 26, 2007. I transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State concerning this Treaty.

My Administration is prepared to provide to the Senate for its information other relevant documents, including proposed implementing arrangements to be concluded pursuant to the Treaty, relevant correspondence with the Government of the United Kingdom about the Treaty, and proposed amendments to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations.

This Treaty will allow for greater cooperation between the United States and the United Kingdom, enhancing the operational capabilities and interoperability of the armed forces of both countries. I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to this Treaty.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 20, 2007.

JOINT REFERRAL—NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER A. PADILLA

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator REID, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that PN 861, the nomination of Christopher A. Padilla to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, be jointly referred to the Finance Committee and the Banking Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 324, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 324) supporting the goals and ideals of "National Life Insurance Awareness Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize September 2007 as National Life Insurance Awareness Month.

I speak from personal experience when I say that you should never take for granted that you will always wake up tomorrow in the same condition you are in today. We can never be sure when our time will come, and it is always best to be prepared for the unexpected. An important part of preparedness is financial readiness, and that is why National Life Insurance Awareness Month is needed.

There are 68 million Americans either with no life insurance or who are underinsured. It is concerning that there is such a large segment of the adult population in this country without proper financial planning tools. In a time of loss, a life insurance policy can mean the difference between having to sell the family home, pulling the kids out of college, or even, in some cases, having enough money to put food on the table. I want to commend the National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisors and the Life Insurance Foundation for Education as well as more than 100 insurance companies for their effort to raise consumer awareness of the important role that life insurance products can play in helping families plan their financial futures.

I am also pleased that so many of our local financial advisors and financial institutions are already actively involved in helping South Dakotans increase savings and plan financial contingencies for unexpected events. By designating September 2007 as "Life Insurance Awareness Month," I hope that the increased national attention on this issue will further encourage people across America to achieve financial security for themselves and their loved ones.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 324) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 324

Whereas life insurance is an essential part of a sound financial plan;

Whereas life insurance provides financial security for families by helping surviving members meet immediate and long-term financial obligations and objectives in the event of a premature death in their family;

Whereas approximately 68,000,000 United States citizens lack the adequate level of life insurance coverage needed to ensure a secure financial future for their loved ones;

Whereas life insurance products protect against the uncertainties of life by enabling individuals and families to manage the financial risks of premature death, disability, and long-term care; and

Whereas numerous groups supporting life insurance have designated September 2007 as "National Life Insurance Awareness Month" as a means to encourage consumers to take the actions necessary to achieve financial security for their loved ones: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of "National Life Insurance Awareness Month"; and

(2) calls on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and the citizens of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs and activities.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2007

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 9:15 a.m., Friday, September 21; that on Friday, following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day; that the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 1585, the Department of Defense authorization, as provided for under a previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, again, I know the Senator probably wants to speak. If there is no further business—after the Senator speaks—I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order, following Senator SESSIONS' statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair and thank my colleague from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

IRAQ

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Massachusetts. I believe this matter is an important one. We have troops in the field who are executing the policies we have asked them to execute. We don't need to be using buzz words; we need to be talking about truth and facts and trying to make the right decisions for our country, and for the world for that matter.

I detect fundamentally in the Senator's comments and from quite a number of others that they believe, as the Senator said, "there is no real way out," and, in effect, we have a doomed

policy that will not be successful. Therefore, we should withdraw now. If that is the fact, I would agree we should withdraw now. So that is why I think we need to analyze this very point.

Last fall, a lot of people were worried about what was happening in Iraq. I certainly was. I visited Iraq in October. I visited Al Anbar. It was a very troubling report we received from the marines. It caused me great concern. Remarkably, Al Anbar region has shown, almost overnight, tremendous progress.

But let's go to the facts. The Congress asked General Jimmy Jones and his commission in May to independently evaluate Iraq when we did the funding for the surge. General Jimmy Jones's report dealt with the fundamentals we are facing. I asked him did he believe it was realistically possible that we could be successful in Iraq. And he said: Yes, sir. I asked him did a single member of his 20-member commission believe that we were doomed to failure in Iraq, and he looked around and asked his commission members, and none of them said that was their view. They all believed we had a realistic chance of success. I asked General Petraeus did he believe we had a realistic chance of success in Iraq, and he said, yes.

So I guess what I would say is, some say we do not. I would say the people—the generals who are leading the effort there—say we have a realistic chance of success. The independent commission we sent over there of 20 members unanimously believes we do. So I think we should base our opinion on the best information we have. As for me, I have to accept that.

I also factor into that rather dramatic improvements in the reduction of violence in Iraq, where within Baghdad we have seen a 70-percent reduction of civilian deaths and a 55-percent reduction of civilian deaths across the country of Iraq. That is very significant. It is a product of many different things. It is a product of the new strategy as well as the new troops we sent there.

So I have to say to my friends and colleagues in the Senate: Yes, this is a tough vote. Yes, we need to worry and agonize and think carefully about the challenges we are now facing, and we need to make rational decisions. Based on the information I have and the committee hearings I have attended in Armed Services, my 6 visits to Iraq, I think we should not precipitously withdraw. Well, they say, this is not a precipitous withdrawal, it is a deadline, and that is going to make the Iraqis do better. But it is not a deadline; it is a precipitous withdrawal. I mean I just have to tell you, let's deal with facts.

The Levin-Reed amendment says the Secretary of Defense shall commence the reduction of the number of U.S. forces in Iraq not later than 90 days after the enactment of this act. And

then it says: The Secretary of Defense shall complete the transition of the U.S. forces to a limited presence and missions by not later than 9 months after the enactment of this date. So this is basically a 9-month mandated withdrawal in Iraq, whether it creates instability and problems in places and puts our soldiers at greater risk or not. Unrelated to the facts on the ground, it is an absolute, mandated withdrawal.

Now, if we were doomed to failure, maybe this is what we ought to do, but I don't believe we are doomed to failure. I believe, as Senator LIEBERMAN said, there are a number of things that can cause us to feel better, and General Petraeus has certainly infused our effort with more leadership and effectiveness and purpose. His tactics utilizing counterinsurgency principles seem to have made some real progress.

For example, he told us he is embedding his soldiers with the local people and the local forces to an extraordinary degree, compared to what we have done before. As a matter of fact, I asked him about that. I said: What are you doing differently? He seemed to, I have to say, appreciate the question because he had been asked so many other things. But he is doing things differently, and he explained some of the things he is doing. We are embedding our soldiers with their soldiers. They are living with them. They are in the neighborhoods. As a result, we are receiving more information, and the number of caches of weapons that have been seized so far this year put us on a pace to double the number of weapons and munitions seizures that we have achieved this year, doubling the previous rate. He said in his mind that may have something to do with the fact that attacks have been down and the number of IED attacks have dropped 37 percent. He didn't overpromise or declare that. He said it might have something to do with that, that we are obtaining twice as many caches of weapons and seizing those as a direct result of more and better information from the people of Iraq.

So I would also join my colleague, Senator MCCAIN, who certainly knows something about war firsthand, in concluding that the limited presence mandated in this amendment, the Reed-Levin amendment, that says that the mission of our forces that are left in Iraq can only be for the following purposes: No. 1, protecting U.S. and coalition personnel and infrastructure—base security, defending our bases—No. 2, training, equipping, and providing logistic support to the Iraqi security forces; and No. 3, engaging in targeted—this is a legal mandate—targeted counterterrorism operations against al-Qaida, al-Qaida-affiliated groups, and other international terrorist organizations. That is all they can do. As Senator MCCAIN said, asking this question: Are they going to wear T-shirts that say: I am an al-Qaida, I am a Shia, or a Sunni terrorist; I am a Baathist warrior, and we can only

shoot at those—use force against those who wear the al-Qaida T-shirts? This is not a practical, realistic directive to the U.S. military. We are not capable of deciding how to deploy the forces we have there. We are just not capable. This is a bunch of politicians—that is all we are—doing our best effort to serve the people. We don't have to be bound—I certainly agree—by a report from a general or the President.

We can act if we choose to act. But we need to ask ourselves, are we going to dismiss the testimony of our top generals and the independent Jones commission about the progress that is being made and the realistic chance of success that exists? In fact, I think it may be a realistic fact that one reason Osama bin Laden is all over the television apparently in the last few days is because he is getting worried. The Sunni support area of Al Anbar in Iraq has turned against him and his people, and they are fighting against him and have devastated much of their capability in the Al Anbar region—a direct change from what I was told last October when that was not occurring. We are working with local police, local mayors, local tribal leaders, and that is yielding progress to a degree we have not seen before in Iraq. It appears to be a model that can lead us more successfully than trying to meet with a bunch of politicians in downtown Baghdad and trying to reach an accord that is going to affect something in Fallujah or Samarra or Mosul. Washington, DC, can't affect Alabama or Nebraska very well.

But this country is not capable of issuing orders that can impact successfully the daily lives in these provinces and small towns. That is a product of the new nature of that Government and the lack of maturity it has. So we are using different tactics that seem to be working.

Well, we have said our military is being damaged and our morale is bad and we have real problems there. Certainly, we have had a tremendous amount of our military personnel there, and they have performed with the greatest professionalism. They are well trained, well disciplined, well equipped, they know how to use the equipment with which they have trained, and they are performing in a magnificent way. They are at risk every day and they are doing their jobs effectively.

For example, a few days ago, a group came to visit my office from Alabama. They were called Veterans for Freedom. It was made up of Alabama Army National Guardsmen and Army Reservists. I had the honor of being an Army Reservist for 10 years. I never served in combat, but I am honored to have been one of them. These are citizen soldiers. They recently returned from being mobilized in Iraq. These soldiers were all senior noncommissioned officers. They had demobilized and were back at their civilian jobs. They asked for a couple days off to visit the offices of Alabama's congressional delegation. They

had several messages for me. The first message was: We have to win this battle.

The group truly believes the contribution their unit had made in the war effort was measurable and positive. One of the guardsmen had been wounded in an IED attack early in the deployment. Thankfully, he was not seriously wounded and he returned to duty. He noted that by the end of the deployment, IEDs were no longer a threat in his area of operation. The message was simply their service had made a difference.

Another message to me was: We cannot afford to lose this fight by simply giving up. I didn't make up that phrase—that a precipitous withdrawal is equivalent to giving up. That is what four veterans of Iraq told me they perceived we were considering doing. They urged us not to do it. Certainly, Iraq cannot be another United States in a short time, they told us. But it can become self-governing and self-sufficient.

The group further stated it may be necessary for us to modify our objectives in this fight, but please don't quit. The senior NCOs finished by telling us they had at least one child, or spouse, on active duty or serving as a reservist or Guard member. This was a testimony—a form of saying to me they and their families believed in what they were doing, even if it meant they have to go back to Iraq again. After making this statement, they were quite polite. They thanked my team for the time they had with us and the few minutes they had to be heard. They came all the way up here to share that.

I say that because I am not hearing the kind of talk from the people who are in Iraq serving our country now that I am hearing from the politicians in Congress. I am not hearing that.

What about Jeff Emanuel, a former special operations veteran of Iraqi Freedom? He wrote an article in the Washington Times recently. He talked about the situation we find ourselves in today. The title of the article is: "Iraqis show courage. Can Congress do the same?"

My colleague from Massachusetts, I think, was a bit too dismissive of the challenges faced by the Iraqi military police and the Iraqi leaders. They have a very difficult challenge, I admit that. I certainly admit that. I think this Nation cannot pour resources into Iraq if we reach the decision it cannot be successful. We will have to extricate ourselves no matter what.

But I have to tell you I don't see it that way right now. This is what Mr. Emanuel said:

... Iraqis in many locations have shown amazing courage, not only by providing an ever-increasing amount of information on insurgent activity to coalition forces, but also by working to rebuild what the insurgents have destroyed, as well as by putting their lives on the line to drive terrorists out of their own villages. They do this despite the fact that they do not know whether they will wake up the next day to find that the coali-

tion—currently their best source of protection—has succumbed to the calls from home (which are heard here by civilians and terrorists alike) to leave Iraq, and has abandoned them.

So they are hearing the talk here. It creates instability and uncertainty for those who want to stand with us and help them to prevail and create a good and decent government in Iraq, if they think we may flee the country the next day. Mr. Emanuel says:

In April and May of this year, and again from the beginning of August through the present, I have been embedded [him personally] in some of the most kinetic combat zones in Iraq, observing General Petraeus's strategy from the ground level in several different locations, and have seen clear evidence of the strategy's effects on the situation there.

I have personally observed clinics in which coalition medics and doctors provided villagers with a level of care that has long been unheard of in the country.

He goes on to say this is still a broken and unstable country. That I do not doubt. Yet progress is inarguably being made, he said. He goes on to note this:

A successful counterinsurgency is one thing, with a timeline which is measured not in months, but in years. However, to wage a successful counterinsurgency and then to build a stable, autonomous and secure state, which we can leave behind without risking its imminent collapse, is another matter altogether.

He went on to note we must not break faith with those who have stood with us and made their commitment.

We all are concerned about the situation in Iraq. The people I talk to—the military people I talk to see us as having a realistic possibility of helping to establish a decent government in Iraq—maybe not the kind of democracy we would like to have seen but something that can work, be a bulwark against an aggressive Iran and be a bulwark in a hostile base against al-Qaida and the terrorists there, who could be an ally to the United States. We have allies in the region. We have a base in Qatar, Bahrain, and we have strong allies in Kuwait and other places in the Middle East. We continue to have those and we will continue to do so. But there is a danger, without a doubt, about an expansive Iran and its leadership who seem to be disconnected from reality in many different ways. Iran's President Ahmadi-Nejad declared a few days ago that U.S. political influence was collapsing rapidly and said Tehran was ready to help fill the power vacuum. He said:

Soon, we will see a huge power vacuum in the region. Of course, we are prepared to fill that gap.

That is from the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 29. So the consequences of what we are doing are serious.

Let me address one more time a rapid precipitous withdrawal and what it means as it is contained in the Levin-Reed amendment. Imagine you are a military commander and you have 160,000 troops in Iraq. You are told you

have 9 months to withdraw everything but a token force to train Iraqis and to protect your own bases and to chase individual al-Qaida members and those associated with them. We are talking about more than a brigade of 5,500 troops a month having to be pulled out. When you have an area of responsibility that has been assigned to a military brigade and you draw those down, then somebody has to assume the responsibility for that territory. How do you do that? That takes time, planning, and care. You can get in a withdrawal or a situation that costs lives and will completely destabilize any progress that has been made. The military commanders have told us it cannot be done. You cannot draw down more than a brigade a month. That is a too fast pace. Remember, it is a brigade that has an area of responsibility of interfacing with American and coalition forces all around it, plus it interfaces with local police, mayors, and tribal leaders, plus it interfaces with the Iraqi Army and Iraqi police.

All of that is part of the responsibility and the relationship that has built up. To precipitously pull out in 9 months all these forces and draw them back to only a few bases and give them a limited responsibility, is a huge, reckless idea that can only result in chaos, confusion and unnecessary death and will destabilize Iraq, destabilize the region perhaps, and cost more lives.

Why don't we listen to what our fabulous general, General Petraeus, has said? He said: I understand we need to draw down these troops. I plan to draw down troops in Iraq. That is certainly my goal.

I will say what I have said many times. The surge was a bitter pill for me. I had certainly hoped that in 2006 we would be drawing down troops, not having to increase troop levels. But that is what we voted to do in this Congress by an 80-to-14 vote. We funded that surge, and now we are getting a report on it.

He said: I have had success by reducing violence in Baghdad and in the country. I am not going to replace a Marine unit that will be departing within a few weeks. That will reduce the numbers. I will bring a brigade home before Christmas and that will be another 5,000-plus personnel. I will continue to draw down next year according to my plan through the summer, and I believe I can achieve a 30,000 troop reduction by next summer.

He said: In March, I will report to the Congress again, and I will tell you what further reductions we can achieve, and I hope to be able to announce further reductions.

That is the kind of withdrawal that is consistent with our ultimate goal, to create a stable and decent Iraq in which the Iraqi Army and the Iraqi police can assume more and more responsibility.

To me, the stakes are so high, the challenges and threats so great that we ought not be driven by polling data. We ought to ask ourselves: What is right for America? What is right for our soldiers? If they are pulled out and this country falls because we acted recklessly, there are going to be more morale problems than we can imagine in the United States military. There are going to be some angry people. They are going to be very disappointed in the Congress. They put their necks on the line because we asked them to. They lost friends and have wounded friends in this conflict, and then we up and jump away and undermine all that effort. It is not going to be pleasant, either.

I say to my colleagues, I understand the purpose of this amendment. It wants reduction in forces. It wants to see us less engaged in the actual military operations in Iraq. We want to see more of that done by the Iraqi Army, the Iraqi police, and that is what General Petraeus wants. He has a plan to achieve that goal. This is a general who has written a manual for the Department of Defense on how to defeat an insurgency, a counterinsurgency manual. Let's give him that opportunity. He is making progress so far. Let's do our duty and watch.

We are not bound by everything General Petraeus says. We are not bound by everything President Bush says. Yes, we are an independent body. We have individual responsibilities to make up our own minds. But if we do this, let's do it right. Let's don't be flip-flopping around. That is not worthy of a great nation. We cannot send

troops in one day and jerk them out the next. Let's follow through in this difficult period and see if we can achieve that realistic chance of success that all 20 members of the Jones commission reported they believe is possible and as General Petraeus has told us he believes is possible. I believe it is the right thing for America to reject the Levin-Reed amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:15 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate now stands adjourned until 9:15 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:37 p.m., adjourned until Friday, September 21, 2007, at 9:15 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive Nominations received by the Senate:

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE AGENCIES INDICATED FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED.

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JULIA A. STEWART, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND/OR SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AS INDICATED:

CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PAUL S. CUSHMAN, OF FLORIDA

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JESSICA LYNN ADAMS, OF OHIO

GREGORY DAVID AURIT, OF NEVADA
MARK J. BOSSE, OF CALIFORNIA
ROBERTA R. BURNS, OF NEW YORK
LYDIA BETH BUTTS, OF TEXAS
LISA ARUNEE BUZENAS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DANIEL C. CALLAHAN, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS L. CARD, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL CARNEY, OF GEORGIA
MARY KAROL CLINE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARC S. COOK, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MICHAEL ALBERT DASCHBACH, OF ARIZONA
THOMAS R. DE BOR, OF PENNSYLVANIA
KRISTEN FRESONKE, OF NEW YORK
LAWRENCE H. GEMMELL, OF MAINE
LEWIS GITTER, OF PENNSYLVANIA
KRISTOFOR E. GRAF, OF TEXAS
SEAN S. GREENLEY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
MICHAEL WILLIAM HALE, OF VIRGINIA
PAUL ALLEN HINSHAW, OF MISSISSIPPI
A. DIANE HOLCOMBE, OF MARYLAND
RICHARD B. JOHNS, OF VIRGINIA
STEVE M. KENOYER, OF CALIFORNIA
RICHARD MORRIS, OF COLORADO
ANDREA JANE PARSONS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MIRANDA A. RINALDI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
AMY E. ROTH, OF LOUISIANA
ERIK MARTINAS RYAN, OF ARKANSAS
DENISE SHEN, OF VIRGINIA
JOAN RENEE SINCLAIR, OF CALIFORNIA
DIANA MARIA SITT, OF CALIFORNIA
ELIZABETH A. SUNDAY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MARY C. THOMPSON, OF TEXAS
LAURA A. TILL, OF COLORADO
MIRIAM ELISE TOKUMASU, OF WASHINGTON
NYREE TRIPPTREE, OF GEORGIA
CHRISTOPHER VAN BEBBER, OF CALIFORNIA
ANGELO RAYE VENTLING, OF NEW YORK
VAIDA VIDUGIRIS, OF NEW YORK
ZEBULUN Q WEEKS, OF NEVADA
DIANE WHITTEN, OF NEBRASKA
BRANDON L. WILSON, OF VIRGINIA
DEBORAH WINTERS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. SAMUEL T. HELLAND, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

THOMAS J. KEATING, 0000